



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/061,492	01/31/2002	Shen Buswell	10011880-1	2065
7590	10/25/2006		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P. O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			CULBERT, ROBERTS P	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	1763

DATE MAILED: 10/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/061,492
Filing Date: January 31, 2002
Appellant(s): BUSWELL ET AL.

MAILED

OCT 25 2006

GROUP 1700

Paul Mitchell
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 1/5/05 appealing from the Office action mailed 8/5/04.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

Art Unit: 1763

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is substantially correct. Claims 43, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,746,935 to Allen in view of U.S. Patent 6,271,102 to Brouillette et al. Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,746,935 to Allen in view of U.S. Patent 6,271,102 to Brouillette et al., and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,238,269 to Pollard et al. Further, Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,746,935 to Allen in view of U.S. Patent 6,271,102 to Brouillette et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent 5,658,471 to Murthy et al.

NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,746,935 to Allen in view of U.S. Patent 6,271,102 to Brouillette et al. as applied to claims 43, 46 and 47 above, and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,238,269 to Pollard et al.

As applied above to Claims 43, 46 and 47, Allen in view of Brouillette teaches the method of the invention substantially as claimed, but does not teach sand drilling for the claimed removing step.

Pollard et al. teach that it is known in the art of forming ink feed slots in an printhead substrate to use abrasive jet machining otherwise known as drilling or sand blasting (sand drilling) to form the slot in the substrate. (Col. 1, Line 62- Col. 2, Line 4)

Art Unit: 1763

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to form the slots using sand drilling as taught by Pollard et al. as a matter of substituting equivalents known for the same purpose. See MPEP 2144.06.

Note that Brouillette also teaches that other methods of cutting besides sawing are suitable for the second removing step and would be expected to have the same advantages. (Col. 5, Lines 55-56)

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,746,935 to Allen in view of U.S. Patent 6,271,102 to Brouillette et al. as applied to claims 43, 46 and 47 above, and in further view of U.S. Patent 5,658,471 to Murthy et al.

As applied above, Allen in view of Brouillette teaches the method of the invention substantially as claimed, but does not teach the use of etching including wet etching to form the ink-jet feed slot in the semiconductor substrate. Murthy et al. teach that an ink-jet feed slot may be partially formed in a silicon substrate by anisotropic etching with any known anisotropic etchant. (Col. 1, Lines 42-44, and Col. 6, Lines 29-32)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to perform the removing process to form the semiconductor slot using a wet etching as taught by Murthy.

Since Murthy teaches that anisotropic wet etching is a suitable method for forming a slot partially through a silicon printhead substrate to form an ink-jet feed slot, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated at the time of invention to form the feed slot of Allen in view of Brouillette using wet etching as a matter of substituting equivalents known for the same purpose.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

4,746,935	ALLEN	5-1998
6,271,102	BROUILLETTE ET AL.	8-2001

Art Unit: 1763

5,658,471	MURTHY ET AL.	8-1997
6,238,269	POLLARD ET AL.	5-2001

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 43, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent 4,746,935 to Allen in view of U.S. Patent 6,271,102 to Brouillette et al.

Allen teaches a method for forming an ink-jet feed slot in a silicon semiconductor substrate having first and second opposing surfaces comprising: forming a slot through the substrate using a cutting tool having an axis of rotation that is not perpendicular to the first surface (diamond saw blade). See Column 3, Lines 45-48 of Allen. The slot of Allen passes through the substrate and is defined at least in part by first and second sidewalls and first and second endwalls extending therebetween.

Allen does not teach forming the slot by making a cut into a first surface and removing material from the second surface to form the slot.

Referring to Figures 4A-4C and 7A-7C, Brouillette teaches a method of forming a slot in a silicon semiconductor substrate having first and second opposing surfaces comprising: making a cut into a first surface of a semiconductor substrate using a circular saw blade, and removing material from a second surface of the substrate to form in combination with the cut, a slot that passes entirely through the substrate. See (Col. 5, Lines 52-67 and Col. 6, Lines 1-30).

Art Unit: 1763

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to form the fluid handling slot of Allen using the two sided slot forming technique described by Brouillette.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated at the time of invention to form the fluid handling slot of Allen using the two sided technique described by Brouillette in order to improve quality of the cut, reduce substrate cracking, and provide clean and strong edges by using entrance cuts instead of exit cuts (Col. 6, Lines 14-30).

Since Allen teaches a slot formed with a saw blade (a structure that inherently has sidewalls and endwalls) and Brouillette likewise teaches a slot formed with a saw blade (See Figure 1 of Brouillette), it is inherent that a first portion of the endwalls is formed by the first cut (said making) and a second portion of the endwalls is formed by the second cut (said removing). Further, an ink-jet feed slot has straight (vertical) endwalls that meet at an angle greater than ninety degrees relative to the substrate. The limitation of the angle of the endwalls as defined by appellant reads broadly on a simple vertical slot.

Regarding Claim 47, Official Notice is taken of the fact that it is notoriously old and well known in the art of cutting with a circular saw to make multiple passes with a saw blade to increasing depth in order to prevent cracking of the substrate. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to make multiple passes with a saw blade to increasing depth in order to prevent cracking of the substrate in the well known manner. Further, the limitation of making multiple cuts reads broadly on any cut made with a circular saw blade, since the blade has multiple cutting surfaces that impact the substrate as the blade is rotated.

(10) Response to Argument

1. Appellant has argued that there is no motivation to combine Allen with Brouillette.

The argument is not persuasive because Brouillette provides motivation to form the slot of Allen using a two-sided technique. Brouillette teaches for example that entrance cuts are cleaner and stronger than exit cuts. This advantage is well known in the general art of sawing with a circular blade. Further, the examiner has provided a reference (Brouillette) in the semiconductor art that teaches the

Art Unit: 1763

advantages of a two-sided saw cut in a silicon semiconductor substrate, the same substrate that is cut with a saw in Allen.

2. Appellant has argued that Brouillette has nothing to do with slots or forming slots through a substrate. In support of this argument, Appellant points out that Brouillette performs dicing which divides a wafer into dies.

The argument is not persuasive. Brouillette is clearly related to slot formation, as illustrated in Figure 1 of Brouillette, for example. Dicing a wafer is a slot formation process in which sidewalls and endwalls are formed during the cutting process as illustrated. However, even if this were not the case, Brouillette is directly relevant to Allen since both references are concerned with forming a cut entirely through a silicon semiconductor substrate using a rotary saw blade. Appellant has not provided argument or reasoning why the advantages two-sided cutting (clean, strong cuts) as disclosed in Brouillette would not apply to the cuts made in Allen.

3. Appellant has argued, (Page 8 of Arguments) "The office contends that motivation exists to combine the references because Brouillette discloses that chips flexed in bending...".

Appellant is incorrect. The Examiner did not use the above citation from Brouillette to provide motivation in any Office Action. In fact, Appellant introduced the citation from Col. 1, Lines 45-48 of Brouillette in the response filed 10/5/04. Nevertheless, the citation in context only teaches that the edges formed by prior art methods of one-sided cutting have damage that reduces the strength of the final product.

4. Appellant has argued that since Allen does not teach that there are substrate strength problems, and teaches that the printhead has decreased complexity and extended lifetime; there is no reason for the skilled artisan to research other slot forming methods.

The argument is unpersuasive. Since Allen teaches forming a slot through a silicon substrate with a saw blade the skilled artisan would of course be motivated to perform the slot forming process using preferred saw cutting techniques. The fact that Allen teaches an "extended lifetime" is irrelevant. The "extended lifetime" and other advantages of Allen's printhead are unrelated to the slot forming technique.

Art Unit: 1763

5. Appellant has argued that there is no reasonable expectation of success since there is no evidence that beveled or stepped cuts would be successful or desirable in proximity to Allen's ink slot.

The argument is not persuasive to overcome the rejection. First, Brouillete teaches beveled and step cuts only as possible "variations" enabled by the two-sided cutting process. The advantages of a two-sided cutting technique, such as cleaner and stronger cuts, do not rely on these variations. Second, even if the variations of stepped and beveled cuts are considered relevant to the formation of Allen's ink slot, as suggested by Appellant, the use of beveled edges is known to be well suited to the formation of

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

This examiner's answer contains a new ground of rejection set forth in section (9) above.

Accordingly, appellant must within **TWO MONTHS** from the date of this answer exercise one of the following two options to avoid **sua sponte dismissal of the appeal** as to the claims subject to the new ground of rejection:

(1) Reopen prosecution. Request that prosecution be reopened before the primary examiner by filing a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 with or without amendment, affidavit or other evidence. Any amendment, affidavit or other evidence must be relevant to the new grounds of rejection. A request that complies with 37 CFR 41.39(b)(1) will be entered and considered. Any request that prosecution be reopened will be treated as a request to withdraw the appeal.

(2) Maintain appeal. Request that the appeal be maintained by filing a reply brief as set forth in 37 CFR 41.41. Such a reply brief must address each new ground of rejection as set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii) and should be in compliance with the other requirements of 37 CFR 41.37(c). If a reply brief filed pursuant to 37 CFR 41.39(b)(2) is accompanied by any amendment, affidavit or other evidence,

Art Unit: 1763

it shall be treated as a request that prosecution be reopened before the primary examiner under 37 CFR 41.39(b)(1).

Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are not applicable to the TWO MONTH time period set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.136(b) for extensions of time to reply for patent applications and 37 CFR 1.550(c) for extensions of time to reply for ex parte reexamination proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

Roberts Culbert



A Technology Center Director or designee must personally approve the new ground(s) of rejection set forth in section (9) above by signing below:

Director Designee:

Gregory Mills



Conferees:

Parviz Hassanzadeh



Glenn Calderola

